

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action identified above, the Examiner rejected claims 14, 15, and 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and indicated that these claims would be allowable if the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections are overcome. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended independent claims 14, 21, and 22. Claims 14, 15, and 17-23 remain pending. Applicants submit that no new matter had been added.

The Examiner rejected independent claims 14, 21, and 22<sup>1</sup> because the claims are allegedly unclear. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegations. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 14, 21, and 22 and request the Examiner to allow these claims. Further, claims 15, 17-20, and 23, by virtue of their dependence from independent claims 14, 21, and 22, are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to also allow these claims.


In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants request reconsideration of this application and the allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 8, 2006

By:   
Milan S. Kapadia  
Reg. No. 55,982

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner did not indicate why independent claim 22 was rejected. However, since claim 22, although of different scope, contains limitations similar to those in independent claim 14, Applicants assume that the Examiner has rejected claim 22 for the same reasons as claim 14.